

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

23 March 2017

**AUTHOR/S:** Planning and New Communities Director

---

**Application Number:** S/3396/16/RM

**Parish(es):** Duxford

**Proposal:** Application for approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the development of up to 35 dwellings following outline planning permission S/0276/15/OL

**Site address:** 8 Greenacres, Duxford, Cambridgeshire, CB22 4RB

**Applicant(s):** Philip Wright, Cala Homes, North Home Counties

**Recommendation:** Approval

**Key material considerations:** Planning Policy and Principle  
Sustainability  
Amount  
Layout  
Scale  
Appearance  
Landscaping  
Housing Density  
Housing Mix  
Affordable Housing  
Developer Contributions  
Highway Safety  
Neighbour Amenity

**Committee Site Visit:** No

**Departure Application:** Yes

**Presenting Officer:** Thorfinn Caithness, Principal Planning Officer

**Application brought to Committee because:** The application is a departure from the Adopted Development Plan and Duxford Parish Council recommends refusal of the application.

**Date by which decision due:** 31 March 2017

## **Executive Summary**

1. This is an application for reserved matters in respect of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for a residential development of up to 35 dwellings, following outline planning permission 13/0276/15/OL; which was allowed on appeal on 24 June 2016. The principle of residential development of the site for up to 35 dwellings has therefore been established. Access to serve the site from Greenacres, facilitated by the demolition of 8 Greenacres, and was also agreed at the outline stage. 8 Greenacres has recently been demolished under a Prior Notification Procedure.
2. When determining the appeal the Inspector identified two main issues: -
  - 1) Whether or not the proposed development would provide a suitable site for housing, having regard to the principles of sustainable development and the supply of housing; and.
  - 2) The effect of the proposed access on highway safety and the living conditions of residents of Greenacres during both construction and operational phases.
3. The Inspector concluded favourably in relation to both of these key issues. Other key conclusions reached by the Inspector were as follows: -
  - (a) Duxford has good access to a wide range of employment opportunities within a short distance.
  - (b) On balance, the site provides a sustainable location for development.
  - (c) The development should be measured as sustainable in other ways, such as employment for the construction industry, provision of increased housing to reduce the shortfall and to increase housing choice, including the chronic need for affordable homes (40% on site provision).
  - (d) The site possessed no environmental challenges to development.
  - (e) Construction traffic would cause short term harm to the living conditions of residents of Greenacres, which could be managed by a Construction Environment Management Plan.
  - (f) The traffic to be generated from the proposed additional properties would not result in an adverse effect upon living conditions of residents and the Highway Authority has confirmed that the accesses are safe.
  - (g) The s106 agreement addresses concerns about Duxford Primary School capacity through a contribution of £65,000. The agreement also secures financial contributions to libraries and lifelong learning, community facilities, off-site public open space, household waste and monitoring.
  - (h) Anglian Water has confirmed the village sewerage system has adequate capacity.
  - (i) There are no objections from consultees in relation to pollution, ecology, and trees and hedgerows.
4. When approving the outline planning permission the Inspector imposed a number of pre-commencement conditions, as follows: -
  - (7) Tree Protection;
  - (10) Ecological Enhancement;
  - (11) Contamination;
  - (12) Construction Management Statement;
  - (14) Waste Management and Minimisation Strategy.
  - (15) Visibility Splays
  - (17) Surface Water

## (18) Foul Water

5. At the time of writing this report Conditions 7 (Tree Protection), 10 (Ecological Enhancement), 11 (Contamination) and 15 (Visibility Splays) have been formally discharged. Members will be updated with any further developments with respect to Conditions 12 (Construction Management Statement), 14 (Waste Management and Minimisation Strategy), 17 (Surface Water) and 18 (Foul Water) at the committee meeting.
6. This current application for approval of reserved matters has generated objections from the Parish Council and a number of local residents, notably in relation to the proposed layout and the siting, scale and detailed design of a number of the properties, which objectors consider would harm neighbour amenity by reason of overlooking and overbearing effects. Other objections relate to matters of principle, access and traffic and harm from construction activities, all of which have already been assessed and deemed to be acceptable by the Inspector, or are covered by details submitted under separate, concurrent discharge of condition applications. Further concerns relate to no provision of a connection to the public right of way on the northern boundary, inadequate parking, lack of green space and inappropriate density.
7. The applicant has submitted amended plans to address concerns raised by the Council's Urban Design Consultancy Team. A second consultation phase has been undertaken with the Parish Council, local residents, and the Council's Urban Design and Housing Strategy Teams.
8. The Outline planning permission was the subject of a Section 106 Legal Agreement, which secures the following developer contributions: -
  - Libraries and Lifelong Learning - £2,359.87.
  - Off-Site Community Space Infrastructure - £17,483.64. (Shall mean a contribution towards the offsite provision of community space infrastructure at either Duxford recreation ground or Brewery Field Duxford).
  - Off-Site Open Space (Play Space – 8-14 years) - £52,997.70. (Shall mean a contribution towards the off-site Contribution' provision and future maintenance of outdoor Children's Play Space infrastructure comprising either a multi-use games area or skate-park focused on users aged 8 to 14 years at Duxford recreation ground or elsewhere in the village as the Council shall identify).
  - Off-Site Open Space (Sports) - £38,510.19. (Shall mean a contribution towards the off-site provision and future maintenance of sports space infrastructure comprising either the construction of a new sports pavilion or a refurbishment or extension to the existing pavilion at Duxford recreation ground as the Council shall identify).
  - Education Contribution - £65,000.00 (Means a contribution of towards improvements to Duxford Primary School (by way of the conversion of existing space into a classroom) serving Duxford)

## Site and Surroundings

9. The 1.2 hectare area irregularly shaped site comprises a field to the north of nos. 8-11 Greenacres and includes no. 8 Greenacres, Duxford. The majority of the site is outside of the defined Development Framework for Duxford as set out in the South Cambridgeshire Adopted Proposals Map, 2010. No. 8 Greenacres has recently been demolished as permitted development under a Prior Notification procedure. Policy ST/6 of the Core Strategy categorises Duxford as a Group Village.

10. The site lies outside of the Duxford Conservation Area and is not affected by any other heritage assets. Furthermore, the site is not affected by flood risk and there were no other site constraints identified by the Inspector acting as a presumption against development. There are some hedges and trees on the site boundaries, notably a bund with some trees on the north eastern boundary.

## **Proposal**

### Amount

11. The application seeks reserved matters approval for the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of 35 dwellings on 1.2 hectares of land. 40 % (14 units) would be affordable.
12. The application proposes a mix of house types, as follows:
- 1 bed apartment – x 4
  - 2 bed houses and flats – x 13
  - 3 bed house – x 6
  - 4 bed house – x 11
  - 5 bed house – x 1

### Layout

13. The layout proposes a spine road which feeds into the site off Greenacres and meanders informally through the site from north to south. The layout incorporates several key character areas, including an entrance gateway, central village green area, arrival square, informal courtyard and informal mews area. The layout achieves 25m back to back separation distances from existing neighbouring properties. The layout proposes a cluster of 14 no. affordable homes in the central west part of the site. The applicant has outlined that discussions with Registered Providers have indicated that there is a preference for the affordable housing to be grouped in this way. A central green space is proposed with a number of primary buildings grouped around it. This central open space incorporates a Local Area for Play (LAP).

### Scale

14. The vast majority of the site comprises buildings of two storey scale; however, plot 27, located centrally within the site is 2.5 storeys in scale with accommodation in the roof.

### Appearance

15. The application proposes a mix of house types, sizes and tenures, helping to meet local needs and assisting the creation of a diverse community. The properties will be constructed using a mix of materials, to reflect the style and local vernacular of Duxford.

### Landscaping

16. The site incorporates a number of small open spaces, including a larger, centrally placed open space acting as a green heart to the site. Existing hedgerows to the north, northeast and western boundaries are to be retained. An existing bund with trees to the north eastern boundary is to be removed and replaced with quality new planting.

### Access

17. Access was formally determined at the outline stage and therefore is not a reserved matter. The sole vehicular and pedestrian access into and out of the site is from the south, via Greenacres. The developer has investigated the possibility of a pedestrian connection to the existing public right of way to the north, however due to land ownership constraints it has not been possible to secure this connection.

### Public Open Space

18. The application proposes the on site provision of 700 sqm of open space, including 355 sqm of local area for play (LAP). The S106 on the outline consent secures developer contributions towards off-site open and community space.

### **Planning History**

S/0276/15/OL – Outline application for demolition of dwelling and garage at no. 8 Greenacres and development of up to 35 dwellings (use class C3) with all matters reserved except for access – Refused, Allowed on appeal 24 June 2016 (APP/W0530/W/15/3138791).

S/2846/16/DC – Discharge of Condition 11 (Geo-Environmental Site Assessment) of Planning Permission S/0276/15/OL – Approved 14 February 2017.

S/2533/16/DC – Discharge of Condition 10 (Ecological Enhancement) of Outline Planning Permission S/0276/15/OL – Approved 11 November 2016.

S/0426/17/DC – Discharge of Condition 15 (Visibility Splays) of Outline Planning Permission S/0276/15/OL – Approved.

S/0427/17/DC – Discharge of Conditions 17 (Surface Water) and 18 (Foul Water) of Outline Planning Permission S/0276/15/OL – Pending Consideration.

S/0301/17/DC – Discharge of Condition 7 (Arboricultural Method Statement) of Outline Planning Permission S/0276/15/OL – Approved.

S/0429/17/DC – Discharge of Conditions 12 (Construction Management Plan) and 14 (Waste Management and Minimisation Strategy) of Outline Planning Permission S/0276/15/OL – Pending Consideration.

S/2405/16/RM - Application for approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) following approval of outline application S/0276/15/OL – Pending Consideration.

S/3627/16/PN - Prior notification of proposed demolition of dwelling and garage at 8 Greenacres – Deemed Consent.

### **National Guidance**

#### National Planning Policy Framework

19. Paragraph 6 – The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
20. Paragraph 7 – Sets out that there are 3 dimensions to sustainable development:

economic, social and environmental.

21. Paragraph 14 – At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and, where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.
22. Paragraph 47 – Sets out that a key objective of the planning system is to boost significantly the supply of housing.
23. Paragraph 49 – States that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
24. Paragraph 56 – The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

#### Planning Practice Guidance

#### **Development Plan Policies**

##### **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD 2007**

ST/2 Housing Provision

ST/6 Group Villages

##### **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007**

DP/1 Sustainable Development

DP/2 Design of New Development

DP/3 Development Criteria

DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments

DP/7 Development Frameworks

HG/1 Housing Density

HG/2 Housing Mix

HG/3 Affordable Housing

NE/4 Landscape Character Areas

CH/2 Archaeological Sites

NE/6 Biodiversity

NE/11 Flood Risk

SF/10 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments

SF/11 Open Space Standards

TR/1 Planning For More Sustainable Travel

TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards

##### **South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):**

Open Space in New Developments SPD - Adopted January 2009

Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009

Trees & Development Sites SPD - Adopted January 2009

Landscape in New Developments SPD - Adopted March 2010

Affordable Housing SPD - Adopted March 2010  
District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010

**South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission - March 2014**

S/3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
S/5 Provision of New Jobs and Homes  
S/7 Development Frameworks  
S/10 Group Villages  
HQ/1 Design Principles  
H/7 Housing Density  
H/8 Housing Mix  
H/9 Affordable Housing  
NH/2 Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character  
NH/4 Biodiversity  
CC/9 Managing Flood Risk  
SC/7 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments  
SC/8 Open Space Standards  
TI/2 Planning for Sustainable Travel  
TI/3 Parking Provision  
TI/8 Infrastructure and New Developments

25. **Consultation**

26. **Duxford Parish Council**

First Response

Objections, as follows: -:

1. Overlooking nature of Plot 1 over the gardens of No 9 and 10 Greenacres.
2. Overbearing nature of plot 35 at the end of the garden of No 9 Greenacres.
3. Overlooking nature of plot 32 over the gardens of No 5 The Old Nursery and No 53 Moorfield Road.
4. No provision of access from the site to Public Right of Way across the north of the site, which was mentioned several times in the Transport Plan of the Outline Planning application. It shortened the distance to the station from 1.9km to 1.3km.
5. Density is higher than the surrounding area – not within village framework.
6. Inadequate parking spaces.
7. Neither direct access to northern footpath, nor access to The Firs / The Old Nursery – as mentioned in the environmental mitigation.
8. Potential drainage issues.
9. Not enough green space – token tiny children's play area.
10. No consideration of planning conditions to mitigate inconvenience, such as:
11. Noise limits.
12. Smoke and smell suppression.

13. Strict time and number limits on large vehicular movements – avoiding the Preschool / Primary School area where possible.
14. No worker parking and minimal contractor parking in Greenacres or adjacent streets.
15. Careful use of wheel washing to avoid mud on the roads.
16. An agreement for no Saturday, Sunday or Bank Holiday working, as children playing (including Saturday workshop in the village).
17. A strict 20mph speed limit.
18. Cemetery extension space.
19. Yellow lines in Greenacres?
20. Any wildlife corridors – such as hedgehog holes.
21. No advice on what constitutes an “affordable home”

### Second Response

Objections, as follows: -

1. Overlooking nature of Plot 1 (particularly by the dwellings upstairs front rooms) over the gardens of No 9 and 10 Greenacres.
2. Overbearing nature of plot 35 at the end of the garden of No 9 Greenacres.
3. Overlooking nature of plot 32 over the gardens of No 5 The Old Nursery and No 53 Moorfield Road.
4. No provision of access from the site to Public Right of Way across the north of the site, which was mentioned several times in the Transport Plan of the Outline Planning application. It shortened the distance to the station from 1.9km to 1.3km. If it is the case that the applicant cannot provide this, then this implies an untrue statement was made in the original planning applications Transport Plan.
5. Density is higher than the surrounding area, particularly given the site is not within village framework.
6. Inadequate parking spaces. Whilst they do meet the planning guidelines, the guidelines provide a minimum, and the use of the garage in the applicant's calculation means that when the garage is filled with bicycles, lawn mowers, etc, the owners will park on the street.
7. Not enough green space. The token tiny children's play area is inadequate and no assurances are given that it will be built at all

### 27. **Highways Issues**

### 28. First Response

The Highway Authority will not seek to adopt the development as proposed for the following reason: the footway to the majority of the eastern side of the proposed development is below 2m in width and while it is poor engineering practice to scale from dimensionally unstable paper it would appear to be about 1.5m wide. This

substandard provision for pedestrians, the most vulnerable of highway users and top of the nationally accepted user hierarchy, would become the responsibility of the Highway Authority if the site were adopted, which presents an undue risk. There appears to be no good design or engineering reason why a 2m wide footway cannot be provided on this side of the carriageway, thus making the site suitably accessible by all.

Please add a condition to any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this proposal requiring that the proposed access be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. The use of permeable paving does not provide sufficient long term surety of drainage and as such the Highway Authority will still seek positive measures to prevent private water entering the adopted public highway.

Reason: for the safe and effective operation of the highway

Please add a condition to any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this proposal requiring that the proposed access be constructed using a bound material, for the first ten metres from the boundary of the adopted public highway into the site, to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety

29. **Other comments on the design and layout:**

30. To achieve a sensible and workable design for the development it would be preferable if the following elements were reviewed (if the footway issue can be resolved the Highway Authority would seek the following to be provided to make the site suitable for adoption):

1. All access points serving more than one dwelling should have appropriate inter-vehicle visibility splays which assuming a design speed of 20mph as per Manual for Streets should be 2.4m x 25m. This area shall be kept free of all planting, fencing, walls and the like exceeding 600mm high.

2. The proposed visitor bay should be removed. Other non-urban developments have demonstrated that such bays tend to be occupied by residents as 'theirs' and visitor parking takes place on street. As the site will not be subject to a traffic regulation order to control on street parking most visitors will park on street as closely as possible to their destination, thus rendering the proposed bays of little value.

3. All private drives should be designed so that no private water from the plot drains across or onto the main carriageway. The use of permeable paving does not provide sufficient long term surety of drainage and as such positive measures should be used to prevent private water entering the main carriageway.

4. All private drives should be equally devisable by 5m to prevent irregular parking whereby motor vehicles overhang the footway and force pedestrians out into live carriageway to pass the same.

The Highway Authority will not seek to adopt the development as proposed for the following reason: the footway to the majority of the eastern side of the proposed development is below 2m in width and while it is poor engineering practice to scale from dimensionally unstable paper it would appear to be about 1.5m wide. This

substandard provision for pedestrians, the most vulnerable of highway users and top of the nationally accepted user hierarchy, would become the responsibility of the Highway Authority if the site were adopted, which presents an undue risk. There appears to be no good design or engineering reason why a 2m wide footway cannot be provided on this side of the carriageway, thus making the site suitably accessible by all.

Please add a condition to any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this proposal requiring that the proposed access be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. The use of permeable paving does not provide sufficient long term surety of drainage and as such the Highway Authority will still seek positive measures to prevent private water entering the adopted public highway.

Reason: for the safe and effective operation of the highway

Please add a condition to any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this proposal requiring that the proposed access be constructed using a bound material, for the first ten metres from the boundary of the adopted public highway into the site, to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety

#### **Affordable Housing Officer**

31. First Response
32. **Affordable Housing** (*Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan July 2013 Policy H/9*) (DCP HG/3). Policy H/9 requires that all developments that increase the net number of dwellings on a site by 3 or more need to provide 40% affordable housing suitable to address local housing needs. DCP policy HG/3 required the same percentage of affordable housing at a lower threshold of two units or more. The proposed scheme is for 35 dwellings which would trigger an affordable housing requirement of 14 homes.
33. The application proposes (Dwg. No. PL.02) the 14 affordable homes in a single cluster to the north west of the site. Paragraph 4.13 of the DPD elaborates that affordable housing should be integrated with Market Housing in order to ensure sustainable communities. It says that small groups or clusters will typically be of 6 or 8 units. This description of the size of cluster in the district wide Development Control Policies DPD is particularly relevant to development in the rural area at villages where it reflects the relatively small settlement size.
34. In correspondence with the Housing Development Officer (Affordable Housing Statement Appendix 1), the applicant has described the affordable housing as clusters '*separated by two rows of parking bays*' with a cluster of '*5 ...located next to private units*' and the other as '*3 of the affordable houses next to a block of 6 affordable flats*'. The applicant sought and obtained approval from the Housing Development Officer for the latter cluster of 9 dwellings, but failed to advise that in fact all the affordable housing sits within a clearly defined cluster of 14 dwellings.

35. The bin collection point for plots 7-10 appears to obstruct the rear access pathway to these properties.

36. **Tenure Mix** *Affordable Housing SPD (July 2010)*

The tenure mix for affordable housing in South Cambridgeshire District is 70% Rented and 30% Intermediate housing. 1 and 2 bed properties are the dwelling types with the fastest growing demand. The Cambridge sub-region 2013 SHMA states that 'One person and couple households make up the majority of the household increase from 2011 to 2031 (96% of the change in household numbers').

37. **Types and sizes of affordable homes** In Major Developments, Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres the type (house, flat, bungalow) and size (bedrooms) of affordable housing will be based on the need across the district as a whole. Minimum space standards that are recommended for affordable housing are set out in the Nationally Described Space Standards<sup>1</sup>.

38. The proposed scheme (in the affordable housing statement submitted with the application) comprises the following mix, all of which are described as being HQI compliant:

Proposed mix	ft2	m2	bed size	units
Flat type A	484	45	1	4
Flat type B	710	66	2	2
House Type D	852	79	3	2
House Type E	830	77	2	6

39. **Lifetime Homes** Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan July 2013 Policy H/8 (3) requires 100% of affordable homes to meet the Lifetime Homes standard. The Lifetime Homes standard has been superseded by new Building Regulations. We now advise that across the district there is a requirement for 5% of all affordable housing to be accessible and adaptable that meet Building Regulations Part M4(2).

40. The schedule of accommodation submitted with the application shows 6 of the affordable housing plots (plots 15-20) as HQI compliant to Lifetime Homes standards

41. **5 year land supply.** The site is outside the development framework and would normally be considered an Exception site (DCP HG/5, Proposed Submission Local Plan H/10) requiring all affordable housing in the development to be allocated to applicants with a specific local connection. However as this site is a '5 year land supply' site, which should therefore provide a policy compliant (40%) level of affordable housing. As a starting point for discussions on the requirement for a local connection criteria on 5 year land supply sites:

- The first 8 affordable homes on each 5 year land supply site will be occupied by those with a local connection, the occupation of any additional affordable homes thereafter will be split 50/50 between local connection and on a Districtwide basis.
- If there are no households in the local community in housing need at the stage of letting or selling a property and a local connection applies, it will be made available to other households in need on a cascade basis looking next at adjoining parishes and then to need in the wider district in accordance with the normal lettings policy

for affordable housing. The number of homes identified for local people within a scheme will always remain for those with a local connection when properties become available to relet.

## Housing Need

42.

The local housing needs for Duxford are currently as flows:

Bedroom requirements	Rent	Intermediate
1bed	19	
2bed	13	4
3bed	6	1
4bed	1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>5</b>

43.

In the above table, the Intermediate Housing Need is derived from the applicants on the Help to Buy register living in Cottenham<sup>ii</sup>. The needs for Affordable Rented housing is taken from the Council's annual Housing Statistical Information Leaflet<sup>iii</sup>. The detailed breakdown is as follows:

## Viability Affordable Housing SPD Chapter 5

44.

There will be a presumption that the development will include full and appropriate provision for affordable housing unless it is demonstrated that it cannot be provided at a rate of 40% or more of the dwellings in a development. The Affordable Housing SPD sets out in Chapter 5 the approach that should be taken by the developer to producing a full economic appraisal. The methodology, underlying assumptions and any software used to undertake this appraisal should be agreed with the Council, with the normal approach being the current methodology endorsed by the Homes and Communities Agency.

## Second Response

45.

Further to the previous response from the Affordable Homes Service, we respond as follows to the amended application.

46.

Our concern regarding clustering of the affordable housing, shown on the amended site layout plan as plots 7-20, has not been addressed. It has in fact been worsened by the removal of the footpath separating plots 12-14 from plots 15-20.

47.

The layout of the affordable housing, which to be policy compliant would comprise 10 affordable rented and four intermediate properties within a single cluster fails to address the requirement of the Development Control Policies DPD, particularly in respect to development in rural areas such as this village where it reflects the relatively small settlement size.

48.

The applicant claims to have sought advice from a number of RPs regarding the clustering but has provided no evidence that they have responded to this particular issue in writing. We would be surprised that RPs would be content with the amended

49. layout, as it is especially important for them to be able to demise the parking for the intermediate housing, and not to have the parking spaces for these units mixed with the Affordable Rented properties.
50. It should be remembered that in previous correspondence with the Housing Development Officer (Affordable Housing Statement Appendix 1), the applicant described the affordable housing as clusters 'separated by two rows of parking bays' with a cluster of '5 ...located next to private units' and the other as '3 of the affordable houses next to a block of 6 affordable flats'. The applicant sought and obtained approval from the Housing Development Officer for the latter cluster of 9 dwellings, but failed to advise that in fact all the affordable housing sits within a clearly defined cluster of 14 dwellings.
51. We invite the applicant to revise the scheme layout in accordance with the DPD with regards to clustering, defining which of the units is proposed as Affordable Rented and Intermediate housing. The Affordable Housing Scheme as currently proposed would not be approved by the Affordable Homes Service.

52. **Urban Design Officer**

First Response

This application is for the reserved matters approval for 35 units, for a site outside the village framework, on the edge of Duxford. This application follows a previous reserved matters application which was withdrawn. I raised design objections to the previous application, largely for the following reasons:

- Scale / design / location of the flats
- Integration of parking
- Poor elevational handling, with designs that do not respond positively to the character of Duxford

I am pleased to see that my comments in respect of the flats have been taken on board, and the layout / scale / massing / roof profile is much more successful and is a considerable improvement. However, the elevational treatment needs improvement.

The parking around the flats / terrace of affordable houses has been very slightly improved, but generally parking is provided in front of the houses, which will result in a car dominated development.

As far as I can tell, apart from the changes made to the flats, the house elevations remain unchanged, and are therefore still not considered appropriate or of sufficient design quality. My previous comments therefore remain:

*The design of the houses is very disappointing; it appears much of the quality suggested in the outline application has not been carried forward into the reserved matters application.*

*The Design and Access statement describes the local vernacular and features well, but these characteristics are not followed through into the proposed elevational treatments.*

*The materials suggested, particularly the buff multi brick is a poor match to the Cambridgeshire Gault of this district. Render is a characteristic of Duxford, and could be used more so that the two buildings that are rendered blend in a bit more rather than standing out.*

*Black weatherboarding was traditionally used in agricultural or subservient outbuildings which had very simple forms with simple openings. The use in 2 storey houses, when combined with gables, mini gables, white fascias and projecting bay/porches is not successful or in keeping with the character of the area.*

*There is too much of the contrasting brick soldier courses suggested above and below windows, garage doors and in arched openings around the front doors, as well as brick banding. I suggest the brick bands are removed on the houses with dormers, and more stone sills are introduced which are more representative of this area.*

*Chimneys were suggested at outline stage, and are recognised in the D&A as a local feature have not been included. Chimneys should be included (preferably functioning chimneys) to help to break up the rooflines of these large houses.*

*The terrace of houses (plots 7 – 11) needs more articulation and less repetition. Perhaps a hipped roof would work better instead of the bookend stepping of the building, and perhaps the introduction of another material would also help break up this long elevation.*

*Half hipped roofs on houses with gables are not characteristic of this area, a simple pitched roof would be preferred.*

## Conclusion

The elevational design needs to be redesigned to ensure that the development accords with Policy DP/2 (all new development must be of high quality and preserve or enhance the character of the area). The architecture needs to relate better to the character of Duxford, it is recommended that the illustrative material presented to the Design Enabling Panel and submitted at the outline stage is revisited and used to inform the designs.

It is also strongly recommended that this scheme be presented to the Design Enabling Panel to help to address some of the issues raised above.

## Second Response

This is a further consultation on amended information (received 31 Jan).

Some minor alterations have been made to the proposed materials (the amount of render has been increased, and the timber cladding reduced) which is welcomed, but the elevational treatment of the flats is still poor, and the parking has not been improved.

The flats have now been attached to the adjacent terrace of three houses. The previous gap between the two was very narrow, but the hipped roof has been lost between the two, so the bulk of the development has increased at this point. The elevational treatment has not been reconsidered when the buildings were pushed together, which results in a disjointed design. This terrace effect when combined with the terrace of 5 properties opposite, and parked cars in front of every house will create a very urban, enclosed, hard space which is at odds with the edge of village location.

The flats have lost their balconies, and now have no external space. The district design guide states that every home should have access to private or communal outside amenity space, to allow residents to enjoy the outdoors, hang washing outside etc. Ground floor flats should have a minimum of 10m<sup>2</sup> of private external space immediately outside their living accommodation, and all flats should have access to a communal garden, with 25m<sup>2</sup> allowed for each apartment, in addition to balconies on the upper floors. No garden space was provided in previous designs which was regrettable (and did not comply with the district design guide), but it is now proposed that none of the 6 flats now have any private outdoor space which is not acceptable.

Developments should aim to be tenure blind, but in this development it is very clear that the affordable housing is easily identifiable and considerably disadvantaged in comparison to the market housing.

I will reiterate again that I strongly suggest this application is referred to the design enabling panel as I consider there is considerable room for improvement of design quality. There is currently one remaining slot available on 9<sup>th</sup> March.

### Third Response

In an attempt to resolve the outstanding design issues for this application, I have reviewed the plans again in some detail and all my previous comments which have been critical of the scheme from the start.

If the applicant is willing to make the following changes to the elevational treatment / architecture, then I believe the scheme will be sufficiently improved to meet the minimum acceptable design quality, and I will not object to this application:

1. Remove all gablets as they are not a traditional feature or characteristic of this area (plots 1, 3, 21, 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35)
2. Remove the contrasting brick band courses at first floor level to all brick elevations
3. Replace arched openings to plot 43 with simple square opening. Remove brick edging to opening, suggest stone lintel to match sills if needed
4. Improve the elevations to the flatted development, this needs to include removing the gablet on the side elevation, replacing the half hips with simple gables, strengthening the corner and changing the materials to replace the horizontal emphasis with something more vertical.

I suggest that the eaves (and corresponding ridge height) is raised very slightly over plot 19, possibly with a parapeted gable, and the window to the sitting room in plot 19 is enlarged to match the front elevation / flat below. This corner element (ie the whole of flats 16 and 19) should be built in contrasting material to the attached "wings" of the building. I suggest a red brick for the corner flats, and a simple buff brick elsewhere, rather than the timber cladding.

5. The Weinerberger smoked yellow multi gilt stock brick is not supported, a closer match to the traditional buff brick of South Cambridgeshire is required.

## Final Response

The majority of my comments have been taken on board, and the applicant has made most of the changes suggested. The stripping out of gablets has simplified the designs, and flats are greatly improved. The design quality has improved sufficiently for me to remove my objection to this application.

I stated in my comments that the suggested Weinerberger smoked yellow multi gilt stock is not an appropriate brick specification, and I therefore recommend a condition be attached in respect of materials to ensure the specified bricks are appropriate for the location.

### **53. Landscape Design Officer**

The scheme is very similar to the previous submitted application S/2405/16/RM. My previous comments still apply for this application. Due to my landscape concerns I would recommend that the applicant considers the following to conserve and enhance the local landscape character and visual / visual amenity:

- Forward a Tree Survey, Arboricultural Implications Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan – indicating existing trees upon the site, trees to be retained or removed tree protection plan and methods.  
*This again has not been included within application*
- Retain trees and hedgerows to the north and west of the site. With the exception of dead or diseased trees.
- New dwellings to be set back from the existing boundary.
- Applicant to also include long narrow rear gardens particularly to dwellings located on the west and north west of the site. Again, to conserve the local landscape characteristics.
- Where practicable, use sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). Applicant to consider permeable paving systems

### **54. Ecology Officer**

As the scheme has not changed significantly in terms of site ecology, the previous comments apply in terms of an overall benefit to biodiversity. Information to discharge condition 10 including the location of bat and bird boxes has now been provided (application S/2533/16/DC) and is sufficient to demonstrate net ecological gain.

#### Previous Comments for S/2405/16/RM:

The retention of the hedgerows to the north and north-west are welcomed, as is the planting of a new native hedgerow along the north-east boundary. Use of the Emorsgate EL1 Flowering Lawn Mixture should benefit biodiversity provided that an appropriate management regime is followed.

The extent of flowering lawn is not clear on the landscaping plans provided. The location and extent of this habitat and a specification for establishment and management should be provided to discharge condition 10. It is noted that information in relation to this condition has been submitted and will be reviewed separately in response to the discharge of conditions application.

### **55. Sustainability Officer (Huntingdonshire District Council)**

No comments.

56. **Environmental Health Officer**

On balance we have no objection in principle to the proposals, but the following environmental health issues / health determinants need to be considered and effectively controlled in order to protect the quality of life / amenity and health of proposed and existing residential uses / premises and the wider community / environment and which are paramount in facilitating a sustainable high quality development:

Noise and Vibration

To address environmental related issues an overarching Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) was required by Condition 12 of the Outline Permission S/0276/16/OL. This Condition required a detailed CEMP to be submitted and include reference as appropriate to each of the items listed in the condition.

Controls on construction noise, dust, building site activities including working and delivery times is contained in Condition 12 of the outline permission, which required the provision and adherence to the CEMP submitted and should carry through. Therefore, no new condition is necessary.

However, apart from an initial scoping document, no CEMP has been provided and is still outstanding.

In view of this, I would recommend that approval of this application is deferred until the CEMP has been submitted and approved.

Due to the nature and location of the development a detailed noise report is not required

Lighting

The level of information required by Condition 13 of Outline Approval S/0276/16/OL has not been provided. No additional condition is required but a lighting scheme must be submitted.

Given the impact of artificial lighting, which has the potential to cause nuisance to and be detrimental to the amenity of existing and proposed residential properties all types of external lighting should be considered including security and public space lighting as well as lighting attached to premises.

A lighting impact assessment / scheme should be provided and should cover such matters as, light spillage, hours of illumination, light levels, column heights, the levels of impact on nearby dwellings including horizontal and vertical isolux contours and methods of mitigating any adverse effects.

Contaminated Land

The applicant should be reminded of Condition 11 attached to Outline Permission S/0276/16/OL relating to contaminated land and should continue to be carried forward on this site.

Surface Water Drainage

Any application should include a detailed flood risk assessment and a surface water

drainage strategy to include consideration of SUDS.

57. **Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems Engineer**

A suitable surface water and foul drainage system has not been identified. Any proposals may impact on site layout and landscape.

58. **Lead Local Flood Authority**

No information relating to surface water drainage has been submitted with this application; therefore we do not have any comments to make.

59. **Environmental Health (Contaminated Land)**

A condition requiring investigation for potential contamination was added to the outline consent for this application site (S/0276/15/OL Condition 11) and therefore no further conditions relating to contaminated land investigation are required.

60. **County Education Authority**

No comments as contributions secured on the outline application.

61. **Head Teacher, Duxford Primary School**

The development is unsustainable because the Planning Statement incorrectly states that the school has sufficient capacity to accommodate the new children. The number of potential children has now increased based on the house types now proposed.

The development will increase the risk to children's safety when walking and cycling to school.

62. **Tree Officer**

Tree protection measures are covered in the outline approval.

63. **Environment Agency**

No Response

64. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue**

No response.

**Representations**

65. **Local Residents** – 18 letters of objection have been submitted by local residents.

The following objections have been raised: -

- Loss of residential amenity;
- Loss of daylight and sunlight;
- Overbearing effects;
- Out of scale;
- Permanent loss of tranquillity;

- Overlooking from balconies and first floor French doors;
- Cramped layout;
- Significant increased traffic;
- Inadequate local highway infrastructure;
- Adverse effect on highway safety;
- Inadequate access for construction traffic;
- Excessive density, out of keeping with Duxford;
- Open spaces are too small and no provision for older children. No LEAP proposed;
- Houses are too far away from the nearest LEAP;
- Inadequate parking provision leading to cars spilling into Greenacres to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity;
- Exceeds maximum of 8 dwellings supported by Policy;
- Concerns about dark coloured materials;
- Not clear what is happening to existing trees;
- Concerns that trees have already been removed.
- Application boundary is not clear.
- Not clear what the site boundaries will be.
- Consideration should be given to alternative access for construction traffic;
- No pedestrian access to the footpath to the north;
- Too many houses;
- Too many houses backing onto and overlooking 1 The Old Nursery;
- Removal of trees and bund will undermine boundary of 1 The Old Nursery;
- Plot 1 will directly overlook 9 Greenacres;
- Plot 35 will have an overbearing impact on 9 and 10 Greenacres and should be moved further north;
- Plot 35 will overlook gardens of 9 and 10 Greenacres;
- Plot 32 will have an overbearing effect on 5 The Old Nursery and 53 Moorfield Road;
- No Citi 7 service on a Sunday;
- Permitted development rights should be removed for Plot 35;
- Poor accessibility to services;
- Properties on The Old Nursery are at a lower level and this could exacerbate loss of amenity;

The following comments have been made: -

- There should be rigorous adherence to and monitoring of the approved construction management plan.
- Please ensure there are adequate drainage / sewage pipes to prevent blockages;
- Please ensure contractors park within the site and not on Greenacres;
- Reduce the number of properties;
- Reduce the heights of the properties;
- Re-design the eastern boundary to give more physical relief to existing properties;

## **PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

### **66. Principle**

67. The principle of the development of this site for up to 35 dwellings was established through planning consent S/0276/16/OL, which was allowed at appeal. The current application is contained solely within the approved red line area, and the proposed dwellings numbers do not exceed the total of 35 allowed by the Inspector. The issues to consider in the determination of this application are therefore layout, scale, appearance and landscaping. It is not within the remit of this application to revisit

matters of principle, such as whether this is an appropriate site for residential development, whether this scale of development is appropriate, whether Duxford is a sustainable and accessible location, whether the village has sufficient services, facilities, employment opportunities and public transport provision, whether Greenacres is acceptable to access the site and whether construction traffic would cause a nuisance and loss of amenity to existing residents, whether the site is ecological sensitive, and whether the site has any other constraints which would act as a constraint to development, such as trees, or drainage. The Inspector has already assessed these matters of principle and detail and has found them to be acceptable, subject to the imposition of a number of pre-commencement conditions, the details of which have been submitted concurrent to this application. The purpose of this application is to determine whether the proposed layout, the house types, including their scale and appearance and the landscaping of the site are all acceptable.

**68. Sustainability**

69. In considering the outline appeal, the Inspector concluded that Duxford was a sustainable location to accommodate this amount and scale of housing development, attaching weight to the District Council's recognised shortfall in housing provision.

70. Moreover, the Inspector set out the following in relation to the National Planning Policy Framework's three dimensions of sustainability; economic, social and environmental: -

71. It is considered that the proposal will continue to deliver positive sustainability outcomes, including employment for the construction industry and allied trades, provision of more homes, including affordable ones, and on a site which does not suffer from an in principle constraints.

**72. Layout**

73. The layout proposes a spine road which feeds into the site off Greenacres and meanders informally through the site from north to south. The layout incorporates several key character areas, including an entrance gateway, central village green area, arrival square, informal courtyard and informal mews area. The layout achieves 25m back to back separation distances from existing neighbouring properties. The layout proposes a cluster of 14 no. affordable homes in the central west part of the site. The applicant has outlined that discussions with Registered Providers have indicated that there is a preference for the affordable housing to be grouped in this way. A central green space is proposed with a number of primary buildings grouped around it. This central open space incorporates a Local Area of Space (LAP).

74. The proposed layout is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire adopted Development Control Policies DPD.

**75. Scale**

76. The vast majority of the site comprises buildings of two storey scale. Plot 27, located centrally within the site is 2.5 storeys with accommodation in the roof. The scale, mass and bulk of the development buildings are considered to be compatible with the local context and will not appear overbearing or out of keeping. The proposed scale is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire adopted Development Control Policies DPD.

77. **Appearance**

78. The application proposes a mix of house types, sizes and tenures, helping to meet local needs and assisting the creation of a diverse community. The properties will be constructed using a mix of materials, to reflect the style and local vernacular of Duxford. Discussions have taken place with the developer regarding the design and appearance and detailing of a number of the buildings following recommendations made by the Council's Urban Design Unit. Amended plans have been submitted which are now to the satisfaction of this design consultee, subject to the imposition of a materials condition.

79. The design and appearance of the buildings are considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire adopted Development Control Policies DPD.

80. **Landscaping**

81. The site incorporates a number of small open spaces, including a larger, centrally placed open space acting as a green heart to the site. Existing hedgerows to the north, northeast and western boundaries are to be retained. An existing bund with trees to the north eastern boundary is to be removed and replaced with quality new planting.

82. The Council's Landscape has outlined the following concerns: -

- No Tree Survey, Arboricultural Implications Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to indicate existing trees on the site, trees to be retained or removed, tree protection plan and methods has been submitted.
- Trees and hedgerows to the north and west of the site should be retained.
- New dwellings should be set back from the existing boundary.
- There should be long narrow rear gardens particularly to dwellings located on the west and north west of the site to conserve the local landscape characteristics.
- Where practicable, use sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). Applicant to consider permeable paving systems

83. In response to these landscape concerns it should be noted that the Inspector imposed Condition 7 on the Outline consent, which is a pre-commencement condition requiring details of the measures to protect all trees to be retained to be submitted and approved. A separate, concurrent discharge of condition application has been submitted to agree these details. The Council's Landscape Officer had no comments to make on this application and the Council's Tree Officer was satisfied with the details, therefore the application has been approved. It is the case that the site does not contain any high quality tree specimens. The boundary hedges are considered to be the best green landscape feature of the site, and these are being retained and, or supplemented. The other obvious green landscape characteristics of the site are a series of modest sized green open areas dotted through the site, linked by quality edge of street tree planting.

84. In response to the other concerns of the landscape officer, it is proposed to retain the existing boundary hedges on the site boundaries and supplement these with gapping up of hedges and quality new planting. It is not possible for all buildings to be set away from the boundaries, however in the main, they are, and the majority of the dwellings are served with a good sized rear and private garden which back on to the

edge of the site, with the majority of the buildings set into the site. In relation to landscape Officer's drainage comments, the Inspector imposed a pre-commencement condition in relation to surface water drainage and these details are being considered under a separate, concurrent discharge of condition application. Nevertheless, they do incorporate SuDS and permeable paving.

85. The proposed landscaping is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire adopted Development Control Policies DPD.

86. **Access, Parking and Highway Safety**

87. Access was formally determined at the outline stage and therefore is not a reserved matter. The sole vehicular and pedestrian access into and out of the site is from the south, via Greenacres. The developer has investigated the possibility of a pedestrian connection to the existing public right of way to the north, however due to land ownership constraints it has not been possible to secure this connection. Whilst unfortunate, this is not considered to be a reason to warrant refusal of the application.

88. Concerns have been expressed that the proposal provides insufficient parking which would encourage cars to spill out into Greenacres, to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity. All of the larger family homes are served with 2 off-street parking spaces, which in some cases is reliant on the garage. It is acceptable for garages to be classed as a car parking space. The smaller properties are generally served with a single parking space only, however within the site there are also a number of visitor parking spaces proposed and irrespective of design and off-street provision, it is inevitable that some residents and / or visitor will choose on occasion to park on the street. The scale of the development and the off-street provision proposed are not such that cars are likely to spill out into Greenacres. In any case, the proposed parking provision is in accordance with adopted car parking standards.

89. The Highway Authority has outlined that it will not adopt the estate road because it is not satisfied with certain design features, notably an insufficient width of footpath. In response to this, the developer has explained that the road will be private but it will be built to adoptable standards. It has also been tracked and works for South Cambridgeshire District Council refuse vehicles. The Highway Authority has requested two conditions to ensure the road is constructed with a bound material and so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway

90. **Affordable Housing**

91. The development makes 40% (14 units) provision of affordable housing in accordance with policy. This was secured at the outline stage and the current application delivers this within the proposed layout and housing mix. The Council's Housing Strategy Team has raised concerns about the proposed clustering of all 14 units into a single group within the site. These concerns are noted, however the developer has outlined that there is confirmed interest from a Registered Provider and the preference is for the homes to be grouped in this way. Whilst it is recognised that the policy states that affordable units should be distributed throughout the site to create a more balanced and inclusive community, the proposed affordable units are of a high quality standard and will form an integral element of an overall quality design. Given the continuing chronic shortage of affordable homes officers consider that greater weight should be given to securing the delivering on the ground rather than being too prescriptive as to their location.

92. **Housing Mix**

93. Policy HG/2 of the LDF states that in developments of more than 10 dwellings a mix of units will be sought providing a range of accommodation, including one and two bed dwellings, having regard to economic viability, the local context of the site and the need to secure a balanced community.

94. Policy H/8 of the emerging Local Plan states that a wide choice, type and mix of housing will be provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community including families with children, older people and people with disabilities. The market homes in developments of 10 or more homes will consist of:

- a. At least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes;
- b. At least 30% 3 bedroom homes;
- c. At least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes;
- d. With a 10% flexibility allowance that can be added to any of the above categories taking account of local circumstances.

95. The application proposes a mix of properties which would comply with adopted and emerging Development Plan policies.

96. **Density**

97. The application site measures 1.2 hectares and proposes 35 dwellings. This equates to a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. This is considered to be an acceptable density for the site and the local context, despite a number of local concerns that the density is too high for Duxford. The Inspector considering the outline application was satisfied that the site could accommodate up to 35 dwellings.

98. **Neighbour Amenity**

99. The proposal is not considered to adversely affect the amenities of neighbours through an unduly overbearing mass, through a loss of light or through a loss of privacy. The siting, orientation, size and scale of buildings and window placements are such that there will be acceptable relationships with existing neighbouring properties.

100. The Parish Council and a number of local residents have expressed specific objections to Plots 1, 35 and 32. Residents are also concerned about the number of new dwellings backing onto their gardens and there are also concerns about the removal of trees and a bund on the north eastern boundary and the higher level of the application site relative to properties on The Old Nursery.

101. Plot 1

102. It is not considered that Plot 1 would lead to an unacceptable impact on the neighbour amenity of 9 Greenacres. There may be a degree of overlooking over the rear extent of the garden to this property, but this will be across the new estate road (10.5m) and Plot 1 will be off-set from 9 Greenacres with a 19m separation distance. This relationship is considered to be acceptable.

103. Plot 35

104. Concerns have been expressed by the occupants of 9 and 10 Greenacres that Plot 35

is positioned too close to their rear boundaries and would lead to physically overbearing effects, overlooking and loss of privacy. An amended plan has been submitted to remove a Juliet balcony from Plot 35, otherwise the siting, position and scale is considered to be acceptable. Both of the existing properties have long rear gardens in excess of 20m, so it is not the case that Plot 35 would be physically overbearing on the rear elevation and patio areas.

105. Plot 32

106. The owners of 5 The Old Nurseries and 53 Moorfield Road are concerned about the proximity of Plot 32, its size and scale and the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy. Plot 32 is positioned 4m off the boundary but off-set. It has a hipped roof design to reduce bulk and mass. There is a first floor window in the eastern elevation, but it is to a bathroom and will be obscurely glazed.

107. The occupants of these neighbouring properties are concerned about the removal of trees and an existing bund located on their boundary, which they consider may undermine their boundary fences and expose their properties to overlooking. To address this matter a condition is recommended to agree a method statement for the removal of this bund.

108. The relationships with 5 The Old Nursery and 53 Moorfield Road are considered to be acceptable.

109. Plots 24 – 31

110. The owners of 1 The Old Nursery is concerned that there are 8 proposed new properties and gardens backing onto and facing their property. This concern is noted; however it is the case that there are acceptable separation distances between all of these properties and this existing neighbour.

111. In relation to neighbour amenity, the Inspector imposed Condition 12 on the Outline consent which requires the submission and approval in writing of a Construction Management Statement. A separate, concurrent discharge of condition application has been submitted to deal with this matter which will control and manage, amongst other things, contractor access and parking, which is a particular concern of local residents and the Parish Council. An artificial lighting condition is also imposed which means that details of the installation and use of any such lighting must be agreed first.

112. **Developer Contributions**

113. Developer contributions were established at the outline planning application stage and will be secured by the legal agreement pertaining to that consent. This includes financial contributions towards off-site community, play and sports space provision, education, household waste and libraries and lifelong learning, public transport and strategic waste.

114. **Other Matters**

115. The Inspector imposed a number of pre-commencement conditions dealing with tree protection, ecological enhancement, contamination, construction management, lighting, waste management and minimisation, visibility splays and foul and surface water. Whilst a number of the consultation responses and representations have highlighted and raised concerns on these matters, it is important to note that these details are to be considered and controlled under separate applications for discharge

of condition (all of which have already been submitted and which have either been approved or are under consideration). It is therefore important to be clear that these matters are not germane to the consideration of this application for approval of reserved matters which relate to layout, appearance, scale and landscaping.

**116. Conclusion**

117. The principle of the development of 35 houses and access to the site from Greenacres has already been established by the outline consent allowed on appeal.
118. This application seeks to agree the remaining reserved matters only; namely layout, scale appearance and landscaping
119. The submitted details are considered to be acceptable. A good mix of housing, affordable housing and a quality layout are proposed with acceptable relationships with existing neighbouring properties. The scale, massing and detailed designs of the buildings are acceptable and in keeping with the locality, as is the proposed density. Likewise, the landscaping of the site is positive, retaining existing mature hedges and supplementing these with new planting.
120. Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is considered that planning permission should be granted in this instance.

**RECOMMENDATION**

121. It is recommended that the Planning Committee approves the application subject to the following conditions: -

**i) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and particulars: -**

- PL.01 – Site Location Plan
- PL.02 – Site Layout Plan – Rev R
- PL.03 – Street Scenes – Rev E
- PL.04 – 3D Views – Rev A
- PL.05 – Plot 1 Plans and Elevations – Rev A
- PL.06 – Plot 2 Plans and Elevations – Rev C
- PL.07 – Plot 3 Plans and Elevations – Rev D
- PL.08 – Plots 4-5 Plans and Elevations – Rev C
- PL.09 – Plot 6 Plans and Elevations – Rev C
- PL.10 – Plots 7-11 Plans and Elevations – Rev B
- PL.11 – Plots 12-20 Floor Plans – Rev D
- PL.12 – Plots 12-20 Elevations and Sections – Rev B
- PL.13 – Plot 21 Plans and Elevations – Rev A
- PL.14 – Plot 22 Plans and Elevations – Rev A
- PL.15 – Plot 23 Plans and Elevations – Rev C
- PL.16 – Plot 24 Plans and Elevations – Rev C
- PL.17A – Plot 25 Plans and Elevations – Rev A
- PL.17B – Plot 26 Plans and Elevations – Rev A
- PL.18 – Plot 27 Plans and Elevations – Rev C
- PL.19 – Plot 28 Plans and Elevations – Rev B
- PL.20 – Plots 29-30 Plans and Elevations – Rev C
- PL.21 – Plots 31-32 Plans and Elevations – Rev D
- PL.22 – Plot 33 Plans and Elevations – Rev D

- **PL.23 – Plot 34 Plans and Elevations – Rev B**
- **PL.24 – Plot 35 Plans and Elevations – Rev B**
- **L1046 – 21 – 1000 P4 – Coloured Landscape Masterplan**
- **L1046 – 21 – 1011 P4 – Planting Plan 01**
- **L1046 – 21 – 1012 P4 - Planting Plan 02**
- **L1046 – 21 – 1013 P4 - Planting Plan 03**
- **L1046 – 21 – 1014 P4 - Planting Plan 04**
- **L1046 – 21 – 1015 P4 - Planting Plan 05**

(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)

- ii) The proposed access shall be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. The use of permeable paving does not provide sufficient long term surety of drainage and as such the Highway Authority will still seek positive measures to prevent private water entering the adopted public highway.**

(Reason: for the safe and effective operation of the highway).

- iii) The proposed access be constructed using a bound material, for the first ten metres from the boundary of the adopted public highway into the site, to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway.**

(Reason: in the interests of highway safety).

- iv) No development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

(Reason – To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policies DP/2 and CH/5 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

- v) No development shall take place until a method statement for the removal of the existing bund on the site and associated replacement boundary treatments have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.**

(Reason – In the interests of safeguarding the privacy and residential amenities of neighbour residents who may be affected by the removal of this existing bund, which could undermine existing boundary fences and lead to the exposure of existing neighbouring land and property to the development site.

- vi) No development shall take place until details of the finished floor levels of the proposed dwellings in relation to the existing and proposed ground levels of the surrounding land have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.**

(Reason - In the interests of residential/visual amenity, in accordance with Policy DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

**Background Papers:**

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies DPD 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission 2014
- Planning File References: S/2588/15/RM & S/0558/14/OL

**Report Author:**

Thorfinn Caithness  
Telephone Number:

Principal Planning Officer  
01954 713126

---